

REMARKS

In the aforementioned claim amendments, claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are amended. Now pending in the application are claims 1-13, of which claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are independent. The following comments address all stated grounds for rejection and place the presently pending claims, as identified above, in condition for allowance.

Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 3 and 8 are indicated to recite patentable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants amend claim 3 and 8 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In light of the claim amendments, Applicants request the Examiner to pass the claims to issuance.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 6, 10 and 12 are amended to clarify the scope of the claimed invention. In particular, Applicants amend 1, 6, 10 and 12 to recite that *the annular restriction member is a ring and restricts the radial movement of the ringlike armature member*. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the figures and corresponding descriptions of the pending application. No new matter is added.

Objections to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of minor informalities in the Specification. Specifically, the Examiner notes minor informalities on page 26, line 17. The Examiner also notes in the Office Action that the restricting means for restricting *axial* movement on page 11, line 24 and page 12, line 20 does not coincide with the disclosure on page 23, lines 13-18. In response to the objections, Applicants amend the Specification to address the noted. In light of the amendments to the Specification, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 10-13 are objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner notes that claims 10 and 12 recite that the restricting means restricts the *axial* movement of the ringlike core member and the ringlike armature member, which does not coincide with the disclosure in the Specification. In response to the objections, Applicants amend claims 10 and 12 to recite the *radial* movement of the ringlike armature member, as suggested by the Examiner. In light of the foregoing claim amendments, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 10-13 and pass the claims to allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,180,469 ("Wiedmann"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an electromagnetic brake. The electromagnetic brake includes a ringlike armature member arranged *entirely* radially outside of the ringlike core member. The electromagnetic brake also includes *a first annular restriction member that is a ring and restricts the radial movement of the ringlike armature member*. Claims 4 and 5 depend on claim 1. Independent claim 10 is directed to an electromagnetic actuator that includes similar limitations.

Wiedmann discloses a spring-pressed clutch with electromagnetic release.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants submit that Wiedmann fails to disclose a ringlike armature member arranged entirely radially outside of the ringlike core member, as recited in claims 1 and 10. Wiedmann discloses a spring-pressed clutch with electromagnetic release in which a magnet body (4) and an armature (8) are arranged side by side. In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to an electromagnetic brake in which the ringlike armature

member is arranged entirely radially outside of the ringlike core member. Wiedmann does not disclose that the armature (8) is arranged entirely radially outside of the magnet body (4).

Additionally, Applicants submit that Wiedmann fails to disclose that the first annular restriction member is a ring and restricts the radial movement of the ringlike armature member, as recited in claims 1 and 10. Wiedmann discloses at column 1, lines 69-70 a series of pins that the Examiner broadly interprets as the first annular restriction member. Wiedmann, however, does not disclose that the series of pins are a ring and restrict the radial movement of the ringlike armature member, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

In light of the claim amendments and the foregoing arguments, Applicants submit that Wiedmann fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 10. Applicants therefore request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5 and 10, and pass the claims to allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,936,053 ("Reucker"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 6 recites an electromagnetic brake. The electromagnetic brake includes a ringlike armature member arranged *entirely* radially outside (claim 1) or inside (claim 6) of the ringlike core member. The electromagnetic brake also includes *a first annular restriction member that is a ring and restricts the radial movement of the ringlike armature member*. Independent claims 10 and 12 are directed to an electromagnetic actuator that includes similar limitations.

Reucker discloses an electromagnetic clutch.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants submit that Reucker fails to disclose a

ringlike armature member arranged *entirely* radially outside of the ringlike core member, as recited in claims 1 and 10, and a ringlike armature member arranged *entirely* radially inside of the ringlike core member, as recited in claims 6 and 12. Reucker discloses an electromagnetic clutch in which a magnet body (2) and an armature disk (9) are arranged side by side. In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to an electromagnetic brake in which the ringlike armature member is arranged *entirely* radially outside or inside of the ringlike core member. Reucker does not disclose that the armature disk (9) is arranged *entirely* radially outside or inside the magnet body (2).

Additionally, Applicants submit that Reucker fails to disclose the annular restriction member is a ring and restricts the radial movement of the ringlike armature member, as recited in claims 1, 6, 10 and 12. Reucker discloses a series of pins (5) that the Examiner broadly interprets as the annular restriction member. Reucker, however, does not disclose that the series of pins (5) are a ring and restrict the radial movement of the ringlike armature member, as recited in claims 1, 6, 10 and 12.

In light of the claim amendments and the foregoing arguments, Applicants submit that Reucker fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 6, 10 and 12. Applicants therefore request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-13 and pass the claims to allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants contend that Claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues, an opportunity for an interview is requested prior to the issuance of another Office Action. If the above amendments are not deemed to place this case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: October 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony A. Laurentano
Registration No.: 38,220
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant